

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN  
SOUTHERN DIVISION

ZENOBIA JONES,

Plaintiff,

v.

Case No. 06-13919

HON. AVERN COHN

KRISPIN S. CARROLL, KATHERINE B. GULLO,  
COMCAST CABLE, THE LOFTS OF MERCHANTS ROW,  
GENESIS VILLAGE, PARKING VIOLATIONS BUREAU,  
EAST REST, GMAC, XM SATELLITE, AT&T, HBSC,  
DTE, and ONSTAR,

Defendants.

---

**ORDER OF DISMISSAL**

I.

Plaintiff Zenobia Jones, proceeding pro se has filed a complaint naming Krispin S. Carroll, Katherine B. Gullo, Comcast Cable, the Lofts of Merchants Row, Genesis Village, Parking Violations Bureau, East Rest, GMAC, XM Satellite, AT&T, HBSC, DTE, and Onstar as defendants. Plaintiff has been granted permission to proceed without payment of the filing fee.

For the reasons which follow, the Court shall dismiss plaintiff's complaint as frivolous pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2).

II.

The screening procedures established by § 1915 apply to complaints filed by non-prisoners and prisoners. McGore v. Wrigglesworth, 114 F.3d 601, 604 (6th Cir.

1997). Section 1915(e)(2) allows the Court to dismiss a complaint at any time if it determines that the case is frivolous or malicious, that the plaintiff fails to state a claim upon which relief may be granted, or seeks relief against a defendant who is immune from such relief. A complaint "is frivolous where it lacks an arguable basis either in law or in fact." Neitzke v. Williams, 490 U.S. 319, 325 (1989).

III.

The Court has read plaintiff's Complaint and First Amended Complaint. They are virtually unintelligible. Although plaintiff appears to reference several federal laws, the Court cannot discern a discrete legal claim much less the basis for the complaint. Accordingly, the complaint is DISMISSED as frivolous pursuant to §1915(e)(2). In light of this disposition, the Court certifies that any appeal would also be frivolous. 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2).

SO ORDERED.

s/Avern Cohn

AVERN COHN  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

DATED: 10/16/06  
Detroit, Michigan